UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,670	01/16/2002	Michael Raley	111325-44	2328

22204   7590   01/25/2006

NIXON PEABODY, LLP
401 9TH STREET, NW
SUITE 900
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128

EXAMINER
DADA, BEEMNET W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _10 November 2005_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-75_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-75_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in reply to an amendment filed on November 10, 2005. Claims 1, 37

and 73 have been amended. Claims 1-75 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Peinado et al.

US Patent 6,816,596 (hereinafter Peinado).

4.   As per claim 1, Peinado teaches a system for distributing digital documents having

usage rights associated therewith, said system comprising:

        a server having at least one digital document stored thereon [column 2, lines 60-67]

        a client computer having a standard application program including a rendering engine

capable of being accessed to render content [column 3, lines 5-13];

        a communications network coupled to said client and said server [column 2, lines 61-67];

and

        a security module which is downloaded and included in said client computer, the security

module being adapted to be attached to the standard application program for enforcing security

conditions for accessing the rendering engine, wherein the security module is separate from the rendering engine [column 3, lines 33-67].

5.   As per claims 2 and 3, Peinado further teaches the system wherein the security conditions include usage rights associated with the content [column 3, lines 45-56].

6.   As per claims 4, 23-27 and 35-36, Peinado further teaches wherein said security module is operative to determine if said client computer is missing any security component software based on a predetermined configuration required for managing security of requested content and if said at least one client unit is missing any security component software based on said predetermined configuration, said security module is operative to provide said missing security component software to said client computer [column 15, lines 25-50].

7.   As per claims 5 and 32-34, Peinado further teaches the system wherein said security module is operative to check the content to determine if requested content requires a client side component of said security module and to disengage the client side security component from the standard application if the requested content does not require a client side security component [column 35 line 66 – column 36 line 18].

8.   As per claim 6, Peinado further teaches the system wherein said server comprises plural server computers and said security module is operative to cause said client computer to exchange one or more keys with a first of said server computers to obtain a validation certificate, said validation certificate permitting said client computer to securely communicate

with a second of said server computers without any further exchange of keys between said client computer and any of said server computers [column 3, lines 5-23].

9.   As per claims 7 and 8, Peinado teaches the system wherein said security module is operative to define a user interface of said standard application in accordance with parameters specified by said server [column 14, lines 16-34].

10.   As per claims 9-11, Peinado teaches the system wherein said security module is operative to superimpose a watermark based on client specific data on a image rendered by said rendering engine [column 8, lines 3-13].

11.   As per claims 12-17, Peinado teaches the system further comprising a transaction aggregator system for managing transactions relating to document distribution and wherein said security module comprises a server side security component that directs the client computer to the transaction aggregator to receive a client side security component in exchange for transmitting user information to the transaction aggregator when said client computer makes a request for content and when said client side security component is not installed in said client computer, and wherein said transaction aggregator validates said client computer, based on predetermined conditions, and wherein said client side security component is unique to thereby identify said client computer to said server and to permit said server to report information relating to transactions with said client side computer to said transaction aggregator [column 15, line 58 – column 16, line 15].

12.   As per claim 18-19, Peinado teaches the system wherein said server comprises a

storage device containing a folder of embedded links to digital content and wherein the address

of said folder is selected one of and to be difficult to ascertain, said security module being

operative to provide information relating to at least one of the links when said client computer

sends a request for content to said server and said security module indicates that that said

client computer is authorized to access the content [column 2, line 64 – column 3, line 13].

13.   As per claims 20-22, Peinado further teaches the system wherein said security module

creates a document containing references to the digital content and spawns a child instance of

the rendering engine to render the document, and wherein said child instance of said rendering

engine is operative to follow the references to retrieve content through an asynchronous

protocol from a secured location [column 13, line 59 – column 14, line 16].

14.   As per claims 28 and 29, Peinado further teaches the system wherein said security

component embeds all security information in a header of a document transmitted between said

client computer and said server, said document having a body that does not contain security

information for content in the document [column 19, lines 47-60].

15.   As per claim 30 and 31, Peinddo further teaches the system wherein said security

module is operative to check a request made by said client computer at two stages, a first stage

filter checks if said request corresponds to a prohibited URL and a second stage filter checks if

said request corresponds to a prohibited directory, and wherein if said request corresponds to a

prohibited URL, or if said request corresponds to a prohibited directory, then said request is

denied by said server [column 17, lines 12-37].

16.   As per claims 37-72, the claimed steps correspond to the functions of the elements of

the system claims 1-36, which has been rejected above and thus rejected with the same reason

applied thereto.

17.   Claims 73-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Luckenbaugh

et al. US Patent 6,311,269 B2 (hereinafter Luckenbaugh).

18.   As per claims 73-75, Luckenbaugh teaches an HTML document adapted to be rendered

by Web browser in a secure environment (figure 2B), said document comprising: an HTML

header defined between header tags (figure 2B, step 233); an HTML body containing content

(figure 2B, step 234); and security information (i.e., Cookie) embedded in said header, said

security information being associated with one or more usage rights [figure 2B, step 233 and

column 8, line 53 – column 9, line 16].

Response to Arguments

19.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-72 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

20.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 73-75 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Luckenbaugh fails to teach a security information

embedded in the header, said security information being associated with one or more usage

rights. Examiner disagrees.

Examine would point out that Luckenbaugh teaches an HTML body containing content (figure 2B, step 234); and security information (i.e., Cookie) embedded in said header, said security information being associated with one or more usage rights [figure 2B, step 233 and column 8, line 53 – column 9, line 16]. Examiner asserts that Luckenbaugh teaches the claim limitations and therefore the rejections is respectfully maintained.

Conclusion

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beemnet W. Dada whose telephone number is (571) 272-3847. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (9:00 am - 5:30 pm).

     If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

     Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Beemnet Dada

January 21, 2006

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100